DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 564 HE 005 273

AUTHOR White, Gloria W.
TITLE Affirmative Action Programs in Small Institutions.
PUB DATE 14 Apr 74
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the National Conference on Higher Education (29th, Chicago, Illinois, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Civil Rights; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Higher Education; Program Descriptions; *Small Schools; Speeches; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Affirmative Action; Washington University

ABSTRACT

This speech discusses background information concerning Affirmative Action programs and the implementation of such a program at Washington University. Emphasis is placed on the development and implementation of a comprehensive Affirmative Action Plan, problem areas, and prognosis for the future. A copy of Washington University's Affirmative Action Program is included. (MJM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

ED 089564

"AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS IN SMALL INSTITUTIONS"

Presented by
GLORIA W. WHITE

29th National Conference on Higher Education
Chicago, Illinois

In 1776 a group of historically illustrious citizens of the thirteen United States of America unanimously declared "We hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness". To further insure these "God given inborn rights" in 1791 the Constitution of these United States was ratified with the first ten amendments devoted to the fundamental liberties of the people. Taken literally, the "people" would be those who possess all the physical characteristics of the human being who inhabit the United States, be they male or female, red, yellow, brown, black or white. Yet as we delve further into the meaning and application of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, we are led to conclude that during the development of our country, the phrase "all men are created equal" applied only to white males and that only these were entitled to equal opportunities to seek education, employment and pay.

While some may doubt such a conclusion, it remains valid for our modern society, three facts of great concern to this conference indicate that the inequality is not of historical significance only.

1. School districts throughout the country are being threatened by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare with the loss of federal funds because of segregation. In the St. Louis Metropolitan area alone four school districts have been cited for their segregation practices.

HE 005 213

2. Colleges and universities have academic disciplines within which less than 1% female and minority students are enrolled at the graduate level.

The Ford Foundation recently published a survey of Black American Doctorates which supports the generally held assumption that less than 1% of America's earned doctoral degrees are held by blacks. 12.7% of those surveyed were 60 years of age or above while 9.4% are under 35 years of age. 52% of the blacks earning the doctoral degree are found in education and the social sciences.

Women have fared numerically better in educational opportunities than the blacks yet the record currently exemplifies gross inequities. Surprisingly, 1920 was a peak year for women doctorates, and the annual fraction of women receiving the Ph.D. has never regained that level. From 1950 to 1970 there were only 15,000 female doctoral recipients as compared to 244,000 male doctoral recipients.

3. Statistics compiled by the National Center for Education show that colleges and universities have stepped up their hiring of women and minority faculty members at the lower levels. However, at least in part because of the discrepancies in rank, average salaries for men continue to be higher than for women. Specifically, women comprised 22.3% of the faculty at institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia (with the largest percentage at two-year institutions). The average salary of 195,843 men was $14,360; and the average salary for 56,054 women faculty members was $11,901.

Moreover, according to the 1970 Census Report, of all the jobs in this country paying over $15,000, 97% are held by white males. This leaves 3% of the other highly remunerative jobs to 63% of the population.

The obvious conclusion from these three kinds of data is that the basic law of the land has not protected the equal rights of women and minorities.

The Federal Government recognized and acted to correct the lack of equal opportunity for women and minorities in September, 1965 when President Johnson signed Executive Order 11246, later amended by Executive Order 11375, which imposes equal employment opportunity requirements upon Federal contractors, and upon construction contractors on projects receiving Federal assistance from H.E.W.

The Executive Order reads "in signing a Government contract or subcontract in excess of $10,000 the contractor agrees that it will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin; and that it 'will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed and that employees are treated during employment' without regard to these factors. In the event of the contractor's noncompliance with the nondiscrimination clause of the contract, or with the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Labor, the contract may be cancelled, terminated, or suspended in whole or in part and the contractor may be declared ineligible for further Government contracts".

The initial good faith effort which a private or public institution contractor with 50 or more employees and a contract in excess of $50,000 must make is to

develop and put into effect a written affirmative action program within 120 days of receipt of the contract. In the case of a university, the plan must include directions for analyses of the work force and of employment practices, of steps to be taken to improve recruitment, hiring, and promotion of minority persons and women, and specify procedures to assure equal employment opportunity.

DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A COMPREHENSIVE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN

Prior to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 recruitment literature and policy Statements published by predominantly black and white institutions of higher education were conspicuously void of non-discrimination clauses. With the signing of the Civil Rights Act there began a flurry of written nondiscrimination clauses which in practice were exactly that. The nondiscriminatory policies of colleges and universities began to have practical meaning when Executive Order 11246 tied compliance to the purse strings.

At Washington University, a midwestern private institution of approximately 6,000 undergraduate and graduate students supported by an academic and non-academic staff community of 5,000, we became consciously aware of the need for affirmative action due to the problems with compliance and suspension of funds experienced by other private institutions around the country. We were motivated to read the handwriting on the wall and to take measures to correct our deficiencies.

In March, 1971 former Chancellor Thomas H. Eliot appointed a Faculty and Administrative Affirmative Action Committee, chaired by the Executive Vice Chancellor, which was charged with four major responsibilities:

1. Developing an affirmative action program commensurate with the University's policy statement of nondiscrimination.

2. Recommending steps to eliminate or prevent any inequities for women and minority employees in recruitment, selection, hiring, pay scales, fringe benefits and opportunities for promotion.

3. Developing an appropriate appeals procedure ... to ensure that grievances and complaints regarding discrimination may receive impartial hearing and just response.

4. Considering the suggestions and recommendations on these issues brought by representatives of the women, minorities and other concerned members of the University Community.

The nine member University wide Affirmative Action Committee contained representatives of liberal, moderate and conservative points of view; males and females; minorities and whites; faculty, legal counsel, first line administrators and second line administrators. Of course, no representation could adequately and honestly speak to every concern encountered in rectifying the historically ingrained inequities, but the wide range of experience which the Committee could draw upon was to prove very useful.

The Committee had two obvious choices in developing an affirmative action program - write a plan <u>for</u> the ten undergraduate, graduate professional divisions and the supportive staff of the University, or involve the campus community (Deans,

Directors, the Personnel Director and special interest groups) in discussing the appropriate guidelines and format and in writing the program. We chose the involvement route.

Unquestionably, involvement of the university community is time consuming, is occasionally unpleasant and is an education in diplomacy. However, on the other side of the coin, involvement produces a complete action document which says in essence "we agree to do the following ... We have analyzed our individual needs and our individual deficiencies, we have thought about our individual capabilities, we commit ourselves".

Utilization of the involvement method found Washington University working consistently for eighteen months in order to finally develop a viable and working program with which we could live. There are two fundamental features of the program which I shall discuss consecutively: 1) monitoring and 2) grievance procedures.

The document establishes goals and timetables for recruiting and employing women and minority faculty and staff personnel in the various sectors of the University. In disciplines such as engineering, law, medicine, math, architecture, and physical sciences, where there are noticeable deficiencies of women and minority professionals available for hiring, the document describes commitment to develop and train minority and women professionals. In order to assess the effectiveness of efforts to attain these goals, the document provides for departmental and university-wide auditing and monitoring procedures.

The birth of Executive Order 11246 and the development and implementation of the Affirmative Action Plan at Washington University necessitated a hard look at and revision of our practices.

Systematically, through departmental semi-annual surveys the Affirmative Action Office reviews the new hirings, upgradings, demotions and terminations of all employees by race, sex and occupational category. Utilization of this survey is quite time consuming but accurate in pinpointing consistently the departments which require special attention in their hiring practices.

Annually, the deans are requested to submit a salary survey by academic rank, sex and race for each academic person in the department. Initially the University-wide Affirmative Action Committee envisioned that the deans, in compiling the data would immediately notice a disparity in salary and take immediate steps to make corrections or have a logical explanation for a disparate salary. Interestingly, the explanations became the rule rather than the exception. Where the explanation was totally unacceptable the correction in salary was made. The annual salary survey is no cure-all but rather a notice that methods of determining faculty and professional staff salaries are being watched and questioned.

At the nonacademic level the University has developed a classification system through the Personnel Office. Effective July, 1974 all nonacademic employees will know what the minimum, median and maximum salary range is for a specific job classification.

At the academic level every appointment is monitored by a faculty committee within a given school. Documentation of the method of search and resultant pool of women and minorities must accompany the recommendation for appointment. The monitoring committees have in instances withheld approval for further documentation and/or search.

The nonacademic positions are monitored on a daily basis by the Personnel Office. Each nonacademic candidate interviewed by a department for employment has attached to the application a form on which the interviewer indicates the reason for hiring or not hiring. The applicant flow information is submitted to the Affirmative Action Office on a monthly basis.

Monitoring the University's Administrative personnel was overlooked in the Affirmative Action Plan simply because the preponderance of women and minorities in 1972 were employed in that area. Recently, three major administrative positions were announced which brought to the attention of the Chancellor the absence of a body to monitor administrative appointments. A Committee is currently being appointed in consultation with vice chancellors, deans and department heads.

Annually, a progress report is compiled by the Affirmative Action Office. The Personnel Director, Deans and Department Heads are requested to review their

progress, problems encountered, to indicate revision for their section of the plan and to make suggestions for more effective implementation of the program. The annual report has been submitted to the Office of Civil Rights Compliance of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare as a method of updating our plan and keeping that agency informed of our success and failures. The document established three grievance procedures to address the needs of employees for a fair hearing of complaints which might arise. I would like to discuss these in some detail.

First, complaints of discrimination brought by faculty and administrative persons are heard informally by the appointed University Wide Affirmative Action Committee. If no resolution is forthcoming the complainant may request a formal hearing by a panel selected by the parties involved.

Second, complaints of discrimination brought by nonacademic employees are heard informally by the Personnel Director. If there is no satisfactory resolution at that level the complainant may request a formal hearing before the nonacademic Personnel Advisory Committee, which is a constituted body of nonacademic employees appointed annually by the Executive Vice Chancellor in consultation with the Personnel Director and Affirmative Action Officer.

The third grievance procedure is applicable to union employees: these establish by vote their own method for filing grievances and making discrimination complaints through their biennial contract with the University.

The comprehensive Washington University Affirmative Action Plan was submitted to the Office of Civil Rights Compliance of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in August, 1972. In April, 1973 the University was reviewed by H.E.W. for compliance and was awarded "the good housekeeping seal", which could easily lull an institution into a sense of complacency.

PROBLEM AREAS

By the auditing method of E.E.O.C., Washington University may appear to have a fair distribution of races and sexes. The June, 1973 audit of personnel transactions documents that 54% of our employees are female, 29% are minority with each group represented in the nine job categories. Additionally 39% of the student population is female and 8% is minority. However, these raw statistics are falsely pacifying, in that only 34% of the top level administrative and teaching positions are held by women and 9% by minorities. Less than 8% of the graduate school enrollment are women and minorities. Washington University does have further correctable inequities and is not yet ready for the Office of Compliance's Hall of Fame.

Developing an affirmative action program is only a beginning. The Key to implementation of an affirmative action program is to locate and attract qualified women and minority persons for a vacancy, which is no simple task - particularly at the upper occupational levels.

Institutions perfunctorily advertise, announce and list their position vacancies as "Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employers" with minority media, women's caucuses, the Cooperative College Registry, the Chronicle of Higher Education, the

Higher Education Association Referral Service, Professional Journals and in other institutions of higher education only to obtain an applicant flow in the ratio of 7 to 1 favoring the white male. Obviously the imbalance is due to the fact that the pool of available white males is greater. However, a not so obvious cause of imbalance is that the term "qualified" when applied to women and minorities becomes minutely definitive. The need here is not a crusade for race and sex as the criteria for selection but rather a recognition that women and minorities traditionally have not been privileged enough to acquire the publication records and the experiential background e.g. major research grants and facilities, access to graduate education, service on policy making boards, managerial positions and opportunities to hold distinguished chairs, which are the standard criteria utilized in determining quality professionals.

The reality of the situation in which we find ourselves currently, is that there are approximately 3,000 colleges, universities and junior colleges competing for the same small pool of minorities and women who resemble either the black portrayed by Sidney Portier in Guess Who's Coming to Dinner or Margaret Mead. In Missouri alone there are sixty such institutions, which number is considered an average quantity.

An additional factor which limits recruitment, is the frequent inefficiency of the organizations and caucuses which purport to focus their efforts on centralizing pools of the qualified disenfranchised. They are often less than prompt in responding to inquiries for candidates, a factor which gives credence to the flimsy argument "there are none available". The searching institution has legally made a good faith effort and will have documentation consisting of letters of inquiry, cancelled checks

and lists of sources notified of the vacancy.

The interaction between economic conditions and tenure laws are two major obstacles to stable and increased employment for white males, women and minorities.

As we recall, the 60's were years of plenty for educational federal funds and were characterized by a period of national unrest. Educational institutions were in a position to expand facilities and create positions, an optimal era for including each of the groups mentioned previously. The fact of the matter is that the law did not begin to protect the employment opportunities for minorities until 1964 and for women until the end of the decade. Unfortunately, the educational economy boom began to decrease as the federal legal interest and support for inclusion of the excluded increased.

Further, the white male professors who entered institutions of higher education in the 60's have rightfully earned tenure and are less likely to venture from security in a time of economic constraint.

Given these conditions and the increasing numbers of trained and qualified women and minorities who are entering the employment market, what is the definition of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action? The law prohibits preferential treatment or discrimination in reverse, the white male is fighting to retain his fiefdom, and women and minorities are demanding what is rightfully theirs. Somewhere there is a volcano near eruption.

Each of our institutions readily point out corrections of deficiencies, but neither we individually or collectively are nowhere near the numbers identified in the utilization analyses required in developing an affirmative action program for the reasons mentioned previously coupled with a subtle resistance to change by employers. I am not convinced that all resistance is consciously sexually or racially motivated but rather one of comfort with persons who fit the traditional image of the American success, which has not been female, black, brown, red or yellow.

Whatever the reason, the Federal Government has delegated authority to the H.E.W. Office of Civil Rights Compliance and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to enforce Executive Order 11246. Interestingly, these agencies are not frequently in agreement as to what an institution's obligations are in implementing the law.

H.E.W., in our experience, has a helpful approach in relating to institutions. This agency develops an on going relationship which is willing to recommend and facilitate plausible ideas for correcting deficiencies.

E.E.O.C. has been much more aggressive on a short term basis. Once you have met with E.E.O.C., which you will do if you inform employees of their rights, you may become convinced that their expectations are somewhat arbitrary. In fairness to that agency, the lack of an on-going involvement with an institution may necessitate urgency in their mission. Nonetheless, rapport wins hands down over an authoritarian approach in any endeavor which involves human relations. My philosophy in implementing affirmative action is you can catch more flies with honey than you can with vinegar, yet, I am not so naive that I believe a sows ear can be converted to a silk purse.

The practices and attitudes relative to hiring, promotion and salaries in institutions of higher education have been generally incongruous with affirmative action and equal opportunity. Professional candidates have been traditionally solicited through personal contact with colleagues in other acceptable institutions. Advertising was considered crass and unprofessional. Promotions were based on nebulous qualities which bore the markings of subjectivity rather than the candidates competence and contribution in past performance. The most difficult area to grasp was the basis for determining salaries.

PROGNOSIS FOR THE FUTURE

Executive Order 11246 has unquestionably made an impact on institutions of higher education. Negatively, it has given birth to a thesaurus of excuses designed to intellectually rationalize the exclusion of women and minorities at the upper occupational levels. Additionally, it has been a source of great discomfort to a stronghold of educational elitists who are convinced that the value of their commodity (education) will decrease with such mundane practices as advertising and determining qualifications prior to interviewing candidates.

The positive effect is found in the raising of the national consciousness level. Women and minorities who have been relegated and resigned to a position of second class citizenship have awakened and are demanding elevation. The individual employers who are not feeling personally threatened are developing and implementing methods which will eliminate discrimination on a consistent basis.

In the 1970 census report women comprised 38.1% of the United States Labor Force and minorities 14.9%. Both groups are in 1974 showing significant gains in the semi-skilled, skilled, sales and technical occupational categories. The professional and managerial positions will require much greater concerted effort before significant progress is indicated. With specific reference to higher education, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education Report of October, 1973 projects that it will be the year 2000 before the female and minority segment of the population reach their current labor force level, on College and University full-time faculties. In 1970 minorities held 5.3% of the full time faculty positions and women 22.5%, figures which could lull one to complacency unless one realizes that a large fraction of the minorities and women are at black or women's institutions.

Given the economy, tenure and the Marco De Funis et al vs Charles Odegaard (University of Washington) case pending before the Supreme Court, challenging the constitutionality of preferential treatment for blacks in admissions ....., the future for real affirmative action/equal opportunity in institutions of higher education is in a precarious position. We cannot afford to have this precarious position give way to lethargy and despondency but rather to a greater sense of urgency and intelligent cooperation between the women and minorities in emphasizing the message that equal opportunity is not only the law but our Constitutional God given right.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM

I. Purpose

Washington University is committed to providing equal opportunity to all qualified individuals in its employment and personnel practices, and to policies and practices which will assure that there shall be no discrimination against any person on the grounds of race, color, age, religion, sex, or national origin.

To insure effective implementation of and compliance with the University's policies and its commitment under Executive Orders 11375 and 11246, positive affirmative action is being undertaken concerning equal employment opportunity. Such action includes:

A. recruitment of minority and female personnel in all job categories with special emphasis being directed toward those categories where deficiencies exist;

B. utilization of existing (federal or other) work incentive and training programs, where applicable, to qualify persons for entry level positions;

C. appointment of representatives to develop plans for the recruitment, training, and promotion of minority and female persons;

D. continuation and development of programs and opportunities for minority residents in the community surrounding the University aimed at better understanding and relations.

II. Policy

Washington University is committed to a policy of equal employment opportunity without regard to race, color, religion, sex or national origin. Decisions on employment are made on the basis of the qualifications of the individual for the position being filled. Decisions on promotion are likewise made on the basis of the qualifications of the individual as they relate to the requirements of the position for which he or she is being considered. All personnel policies - including those on compensation, fringe benefits, transfers, training programs, and the like - are administered without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. These policies apply to all employees in all schools and departments of the University.

HE 005 273

These policies are stated in the Policies and Procedure Manual for non-academic employees on the Hilltop Campus as follows:

Equal Employment Opportunity

> Washington University believes that the selection, training, and advancement of employees should be based on merit. The University is fully committed to a policy of nondiscrimination in the treatment of employees or applicants as regards race, color, religion, sex, age or national origin.

They are stated in the Guidelines, Personnel Policies and Procedures for Nonacademic Staff of the Medical School as follows:

> Washington University recruits nonacademic staff having the desired qualifications through the Missouri Employment Service, through private employment agencies and through many other sources. Consistent with the requirements of the Fair Employment Practices Act, both recruitment and selection are done without consideration for race, creed, color, national origin, religion or sex of the applicant.

The University is also committed to Affirmative Action to increase the numbers and job levels of members of minority groups and of women in those areas in which numbers may be low in relation to the available supply of qualified individuals. To this end, an Affirmative Action Program has been developed and an Affirmative Action Officer has been appointed.

Chancellor William H. Danforth stated the University policy on affirmative action in a letter to members of the faculty, administrative officers and staff dated December 13, 1971, as follows:

> "Other interests and problems may demand our attention, but the Affirmative Action Program must be kept on the front burner by the administration and by every division, department and school. Affirmative action should come to mind every time we seek a new person. What is right to do is what we must do because national and institutional goals coincide with federal regulations. Without considerable effort, however, all our good intentions will amount to nothing."

III. Dissemination

A. Internal

1. Washington University's policy statement has been distributed to all employees of the University, via handbooks and policy and procedures statements, and the Chancellor's quarterly letter. (See Exhibits #1 & 2)

2. Meetings have been - and are continuing to be - held with the Council of Deans, the administrative staff, and department heads and supervisors, outlining the University's commitment to and responsibilities under Executive Orders 11246 and 11375. In addition, the University, through its designated representatives, has discussed equal employment opportunity with employees and supervisors in seminars and has conducted internal compliance reviews in the major administrative departments. Such reviews will continue systematically. A copy of the University policy statement has been given to department heads.

3. The membership of the already functioning Personnel Advisory Committee (nonacademic employees on the Hilltop Campus) has been expanded to insure adequate representation of minorities and women in the University community, and an Affirmative Action Subcommittee has been appointed. The Medical School has also appointed a nonacademic Affirmative Action Committee. The Chancellor has appointed a Faculty and Administrative Affirmation Action Committee. The Personnel Advisory Committee, the Affirmative Action Committees, and the Faculty and Administrative Affirmative Action Committee, will advise the University's Affirmative Action Officer and the Personnel Director concerning ways of assuring equal opportunity for all members of the University community.

4. The University policy of equal employment opportunity for women and minorities has been posted on permanent bulletin boards throughout the University.

B. External

1. Recruitment sources will be informed of the University's Equal Employment Policy and its Affirmative Action Program.

2. Included in all recruiting advertisements is the wording, "An Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Employer."

3. The University's equal employment opportunity policy has been brought to the attention of union officials. Their cooperation has been assured. All union contracts include a nondiscrimination clause. (See Exhibits #3 & 4)

4. Construction contractors are required to have federally approved affirmative action programs; copies of such programs are on file with the University and are regularly monitored.

5. Written notification of University policy with regard to equal employment opportunity and affirmative action programs has been sent to subcontractors, vendors, and suppliers, requesting their compliance. (See Exhibit #5)

6. A clause requiring equal employment opportunity is inserted in all purchase orders, leases, and contracts. (See Exhibit #6)

IV. Responsibility for Implementation

A. Responsibility for implementation and monitoring of University policy in equal employment opportunity, as well as coordination of affirmative action efforts into a coherent and systematic University-wide program, rests with the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor. Coordination of affirmative action efforts includes (a) identification of problem areas, (b) establishment of objectives and goals in problem areas and the establishment of action-oriented programs to meet these goals, and (c) design of audit and reporting systems.

B. The Executive Vice Chancellor has delegated general responsibility for leadership in development, implementation and periodic evaluation of effective programs to carry out this policy to a number of individuals and offices according to the University functions they perform.

C. General responsibility for implementation of the policy with respect to faculty and administrative staff rests with the deans and administrative department heads. The various directors and department chairmen will be responsible for carrying out all aspects of the program within their particular divisions.

D. In March 1971, Chancellor Thomas H. Eliot appointed a Faculty and Administrative Affirmative Action Committee. In appointing this Committee he stated:

> "the University's commitment to equal opportunity is one of long standing; its participation in affirmative action programs is more recent. The new Committee has been established in recognition of the

fact that there are some traditions and objectives of the employer-employee relationship which are peculiar to the academic and administrative positions in the University. The development of an affirmative action program suited to these special needs will require careful consideration of the several complex issues involved as well as a real awareness of the personnel practices women and minority group employees may perceive as discriminatory."

This Committee was charged with:

1. recommending steps to eliminate or prevent any inequities for women and minority employees in recruitment, selection, hiring, pay scales, fringe benefits, and opportunities for promotion;

2. developing an appropriate appeals procedure to insure that academic or administrative employee grievances and complaints regarding discrimination may receive impartial hearing and just response;

3. considering the suggestions and recommendations on these issues brought by representatives of the women and minority groups in administrative and academic positions, as well as those brought by other concerned members of the University community.

Any member of the faculty or administrative staff who believes that discrimination exists, or has occurred, should first follow normal channels for resolving the problem, and if these have been exhausted without satisfaction, should then bring the complaint to the attention of this Committee. This may be done informally by contacting any member of the Committee or may be done by submitting the information to the secretary in writing. If the matter is not resolved satisfactorily, a request may be made for a formal hearing. This hearing will follow the procedures as stated in the Affirmative Action Hearing Procedures (Faculty and Administrative Officers). These procedures have been approved by the Faculty and Administrative Affirmative Action Committee, the Senate Council, the Council of Deans, and the Chancellor. (See Exhibit #7 for copy of these procedures)

E. General responsibility for the policy in nonacademic employment on the Hilltop Campus resides with the Personnel Director as coordinator of the hiring of nonacademic employees. The various directors and department heads will, of course, be responsible for implementing the program within their particular divisions.

F. A Nonacademic Personnel Advisory Committee has been functioning on the Hilltop Campus since 1967. Its present membership totals 11, including male and female, black and white, union and nonunion members. This Committee has dealt with a number of employee complaints, including several involving discrimination charges. A more structured procedure has now been developed for the special handling of discrimination-type cases. This involves appointment of an "Affirmative Action Subcommittee," charged with the same responsibilities as in IV., D. 1, 2, and 3, on behalf of nonacademic employees.

Any member of the nonacademic staff who believes that discrimination exists, or has occurred, should first follow normal channels for resolving the problem, and if these have been exhausted without satisfaction, should then bring the complaint to the attention of the Affirmative Action Subcommittee. This may be done informally by contacting any member of the Subcommittee, or may be done by submitting the information to the Chairman of the Nonacademic Personnel Advisory Committee in writing. If the matter is not resolved satisfactorily, a request may be made for a formal hearing. This hearing will follow the procedures as stated in the Hearing Procedures for Nonacademic Employees. These procedures have been approved by the Nonacademic Personnel Advisory Committee and the Chancellor. (See Exhibit #8 for copy of these procedures)

G. The Assistant Vice Chancellor who is responsible for construction and maintenance is charged with advising construction and alteration contractors of the equal opportunity requirements. The Director of Procurement and Contract Administration administers the policy with respect to vendors and all contractors other than those in the construction field.

H. The position of Affirmative Action Officer has been established and filled. This Officer reports to the Executive Vice Chancellor who has assigned responsibility to him to:

1. coordinate affirmative action efforts, including the identification of problem areas, coordination of programs to correct any deficiencies, and the design of audit and reporting systems;

2. assist members of management in resolving problems relative to any requirement or provision of the Program;

3. act as consultant and advisor to academic deans and department heads in their efforts to recruit minority and women employees and in their documentation of the processes of recruitment, selection, and utilization aimed at the achievement of the objectives of the Affirmative Action Program and equal employment policies;

4. analyze and evaluate reports filed by deans, department heads and supervisors designed to record progress toward achieving the objectives of the Affirmative Action Program;

5. act as consultant and advisor to University officers responsible for advising construction and alteration contractors of the equal opportunity requirements, and to the procurement officers who oversee the University's relations with vendors and contractors other than those engaged in construction projects;

6. act as a resource person and consultant to the Personnel Advisory Committee and the various Affirmative Action committees throughout the University;

7. keep deans, department heads, and supervisors informed of the latest developments relating to fair and equal employment and the requirements and progress of affirmative action at Washington University;

8. serve as liaison between the University and governmental equal employment opportunity compliance agencies, minority organizations, and community action groups.

V. Identification of Problem Areas

VI. Goals

VII. Action-Oriented Program Development

VIII. Monitoring and Audit Procedures

Sections V, VI, VII, and VIII are presented for major personnel groups in the University as follows:

Hilltop Campus

Academic Positions
Nonacademic Positions

Medical Campus

School of Dentistry
Academic Positions
Nonacademic Positions

School of Medicine
Academic Positions
Nonacademic Positions

IX. Community Relations and Involvement

Hilltop Campus - Academic Positions

V. Identification of Problem Areas
VI. Goals and General Timetables
VII. Action-Oriented Program Development
VIII. Monitoring and Audit Procedures

Washington University will continue its efforts to achieve a diverse, multi-racial faculty and professional staff capable of providing excellence in education for its students and enrichment for the University community. While recognizing that it would not be sound policy to establish affirmative action goals based simply on the availability of minority and women applicants, the University is nevertheless committed to the vigorous recruitment of both minority and women candidates having qualifications and potentials comparable to nonminorities and males. This commitment extends to the selection of graduate students for teaching and research assistant positions.

Further, the University views its responsibilities in the areas of academic and faculty appointments as greater than simply providing "equal opportunity" and will make positive efforts to insure that all of its employees are encouraged to develop to their full potential to the extent that opportunities are available.

Women in management categories declined from 24 percent in 1967 to 20 percent in 1972, from 66 percent of the technician category in 1967 to 60 percent in 1972. The percentage of women in the nonprofessional and nontechnical categories increased slightly from 59 percent in 1967 up to 60 percent in 1972. (See Exhibits #10, #14 and #15)

The relatively disadvantaged position of women and minority employees, arising from their under-representation, seems in part due to the University's historic practice of decentralized hiring. Although this system is effective and advantageous for some purposes, it does have disadvantages. In particular, hiring practices and the exercise of prerogatives aimed at providing equal access to employment and promotion are difficult to monitor. Policies of promotion and transfer have not yet been codified and vary among departments. The quality of commitment to principles of equal employment opportunity practices has varied from department to department. Follow-up on job referrals to departments from the University's personnel office is correspondingly difficult to accomplish and to invest with meaning.

The University has recently adopted policies and instituted procedures (stated elsewhere in this document) which will assure compliance with its long-time policy of fair and equal employment opportunity throughout its structure for women and minorities.

VI. Goals and General Timetables

A. Annually, each department or division will develop - along with the Affirmative Action Office - its own set of realistic, detailed goals based on:

1. the number of positions it estimates will be available through attrition, expansion, or replacement;

2. utilization of data on the composition of its nonacademic staff and of the metropolitan area which will lead to the establishment of the goals the department expects to achieve in the coming year for a minimum number of female and minority employees for positions at entry and above-entry levels.

B. A program will be established for the active recruitment of women and minorities to apply for those jobs where they have been previously under-represented and the inclusion of women and minority candidates in management training programs heretofore attended primarily by nonminority males.

Hilltop Campus - Nonacademic Positions

V. Identification of Problem Areas

U. S. Department of Labor (Bureau of Labor Statistics) statistics for the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) for St. Louis reveal the following:

> In the St. Louis central city labor force, 42 percent are classed as "Negro and other races." This figure drops to 15.6 percent when the extended metropolitan area is considered. These are 1970 census figures. Subsequent estimates place the extended metropolitan area's "Negro and other races" category to slightly under 20 percent (December 1971).

No figures were available showing the percentage of women in the central city working force, but 44 percent of the metropolitan area's work force were females at the time of the 1970 census.

The two campuses of Washington University are uniquely located. The Medical campus is just outside an overwhelmingly Black area to the north, an almost all non-Black area to the south, industrial plants to the east, and a large city park to the west. The Main campus, about two miles from the Medical campus, is located at the western edge of the park mentioned. A small part of this campus is inside St. Louis "city limits, but the bulk of the campus is distributed within two other townships and the county of St. Louis." One of these townships includes a significant number of minority people.

In the area of office and clerical workers, there has been a consistent and appreciable improvement in terms of minority employment over the years. Women have traditionally been in the majority in this category. The percentage of Blacks in the professional category has doubled (having a 1962 base of 1.2 percent, moving to 1.3 percent in 1967, and up to 2.6 percent in 1972). (See Exhibit #9) In ten years the percentage of Blacks in nonprofessional and nontechnical categories rose from 18.2 percent to 28.5 percent. This gain was largely in the food and housing service areas. The 1972 EEO-1 Report listed 69 percent of these workers as Black, as contrasted with 6.3 percent in the "officials and managers" category and 2.6 percent in the "professional" category.

Insofar as Black employees are concerned, the problem lies in their concentration in the "service" categories, their near-total under-representation in the "professional" category and in the vital areas having to do with undergraduate student-university relations.

C. A series of regular meetings of Personnel staff and supervisors will be instituted by December 31, 1972, for the purpose of developing improved methods of employee evaluation, better skills in recognizing and resolving problems between supervisors and employees, and general sensitization of supervisors and employees with regard to the principles of Affirmative Action.

D. The overall percentages of numbers of women and minorities employed at Washington University adequately reflect their ratio-to-total work force in the St. Louis area. As has been stated elsewhere in this document, Black and other racial categories are under-represented at management and professional levels. Women show a trend toward fewer numbers at these levels. A stringent budget is a reality which faces the University and which severely limits the number of "new hires." Most employment openings are the result of attrition, and this condition is anticipated to prevail for at least the 1972-1973 fiscal year.

Goals, therefore, have been set with the above factors in mind. (See Exhibit #13)

VII. Action-Oriented Program Development

Beginning in the fall, 1970, the University began conducting, and is continuing, an "in-house" compliance review of departments within the University. On the basis of the findings from this review, Washington University commits itself to the development and execution of action-oriented programs to eliminate problems which exist and to attain established goals and objectives. The programs follow:

A. Supervisors and Department Heads

1. Supervisors and administrative department heads are being given the Affirmative Action Quarterly Report form (Exhibit #11) for their utilization and regular review procedure.

2. All administrative department heads and supervisors have been, and will continue to be, briefed and instructed on the Affirmative Action Program and equal employment opportunity endeavors of the University. Progress reports are submitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor by the supervisors and administrative heads through the Affirmative Action Officer. Seminars concerning the Affirmative Action Program and equal employment

opportunity developments, with the Affirmative Action Officer present, will continue to be held in each of the major departments of the University.

3. All applicants are interviewed strictly on the basis of their qualifications and ability to perform the job required. In those job categories in which goals for minority or female employment have not been met, no new appointment will be approved without evidence that intensive efforts have been made to identify and recruit qualified minority or female applicants. The determination of such efforts will be made by the Director of Personnel and the Affirmative Action Officer. They will present data on such cases for review on a quarterly basis to the Affirmative Action Subcommittee of the Nonacademic Personnel Advisory Committee.

4. Supervisors and department heads encourage employees to develop skills which will enable them to be considered for advanced positions when such positions are open. Supervisors and department heads are to make themselves available for participation in training programs, when offered, which will provide them with some background on human relations skills, and an understanding of minority history and cultural differences.

5. Supervisors will furnish, and update where necessary, job descriptions as well as requirements for all positions in their departments or for which they are responsible. This data is to be kept in the Personnel Office.

6. Supervisors and department heads will list all job vacancies, as they occur, with the Personnel Office and cooperate with the Personnel Office in order to insure that proper and timely job descriptions are on file in that Office for current vacancies within the department.

7. Department heads and supervisors will furnish the Personnel Office with the necessary information for program evaluation, result measuring, and determination of areas requiring new or additional affirmative actions. Procedures for measuring female and minority applicant flow, interviews and patterns of trans-

fer and upgrading are being established. An annual personnel evaluation, with particular sensitivity to the status of women and minority group members, will be made. These procedures for measurement and evaluation are being worked out through the cooperation of supervisors and department heads with the Affirmative Action Officer and the Personnel Director.

B. Personnel Department

Increased efforts are needed at Washington University to coordinate all employment efforts (some of which are now performed by organizational units within the University). Progress toward the development of a more precise and all-embracing system of employment requisition and follow-through is being made.

1. An in-house organ for the dissemination of information concerning position vacancies will be regularly circulated throughout the nonacademic community. Ordinarily, such vacancies must be of a promotional nature, and will be disclosed to the nonacademic community before listing with off-campus recruiting sources.

2. Employment openings will be listed with the Missouri State Employment Service, the minority news media, as well as the usual media (daily newspapers, etc.). The University recognizes that certain organizations, such as the Urban League, are ordinarily prepared to refer qualified minority applicants. Their services will be utilized.

3. The Personnel Office will investigate and establish, where practicable, training opportunities and programs for training service workers (now largely minority persons) and other nonacademic clerical employees for promotion to office and managerial positions when such opportunities for employment occur.

4. The Personnel Office will continue to maintain and develop records containing follow-up information on results of interviews conducted by supervisors and department heads with applicants referred to them. A review of such records will be conducted

at regular intervals by the Affirmative Action Officer as part of a monitoring system.

5. The Personnel Office will continue and refine its efforts toward assisting employees and supervisors in problem handling and solution.

6. Relations and communication between such agencies as the Work Incentive Program (WIN), Vocational Improvement Program (VIP), and the University's Career Scholarship Program are being established and expedited in the endeavor to prepare minority and disadvantaged for entry-level positions.

VIII. Monitoring and Audit Procedures

The Affirmative Action Officer shall:

A. By personal contact with department heads and supervisors and the regular examination of records, determine departmental progress toward:

1. meeting agreed upon goals for increasing representation or minority and female employees in the organizational unit;

2. sensitization of organizational unit leaders to the needs and aspirations of employees.

B. Consult regularly with the Personnel Office, using as the basis for consultation the following records:

1. applicant flow records of minorities and women--indicating referrals to organizational units and action taken on such referrals by the organizational unit;

2. transfer and upgrading procedures aimed at insuring fair and equitable opportunities for the participation of all employees;

3. records containing current listings of all employees by class (including race and sex indications) and minority percentages for comparison with goals established;

4. exit interview records with minority/sex group notation to determine if negative trends may exist and, if so, to initiate possible corrective action.

C. Consult with officers of the University charged with construction, physical alterations, and procurement and review progress.

D. Insure that all University employees at all levels are informed of the existence of grievance hearing procedures. Results of all deliberations of the grievance hearing subcommittees are to be reviewed by the Affirmative Action Officer and included in his periodic reports to the Executive Vice Chancellor.

IX. Community Relations and Involvement

A. Washington University will continue to cooperate and work with educational institutions, community groups and governmental agencies, as well as minority group organizations having equal employment opportunity objectives so as to help to develop meaningful ways of removing barriers to equitable employment for minority groups and women, and to establish and improve educational opportunities and other programs which will facilitate equitable employment and advancement opportunities for minorities and women.

B. The University has signed a contract with Project Equality, a nation-wide nonprofit service organization which seeks through voluntary negotiations and professional evaluation to identify firms which are fair employers and to encourage its participating organizations to do business with such firms.
(See Exhibit #12)

C. The University will inform the two local minority construction contractor associations (Urban Contractors' Alliance and the Minority Contractors Association) of bid offerings and encourage these organizations to participate in bidding.

D. The University will continue active participation in the Skinker-DeBaliviere Community Council (concerned with the area immediately adjacent to Washington University). Through this organization, the University will implement its already extensive involvment in the neighborhood.